

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/628,380	07/29/2003	Dong Han Sco	LT-0037	4334	
34610 • KED & ASSO	7590 07/11/2007 CIATES, LLP		EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 2212	00		TRAN, CON P		
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2615		
		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/628,380	SEO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	•
Con P. Tran	2615	

	Con i : man	2010				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 18 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply n	ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	·					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mail	ng date of the final reject	ion.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).	•				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amour shortened statutory period for reply or r than three months after the mailing o	t of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)),	to avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	· · ·					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	• *					
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	• • •					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		compliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		•	-			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		vill be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: 6-8,10-12,28 and 30. Claim(s) rejected: 5,13,14,16,18,19,27 and 29. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a lid date of fi	Notice of Appeal will <u>no</u> avit or other evidence i	at be entered s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under app	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attacl	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☒ Other: The drawings are accepted by the examiner. 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	PRIMARY EXAMIN	NER			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claim 7 has changed the scope of claims 7-8, 10-12. Therefore, further consideration and/or search would be needed.

Regarding Applicants' argument volume control circuit 114 only controls the volume of the audio signal on that one channel, and that O'Brien does not disclose the gain control means of claim 5. Examiner respectfully disagreed. Since Fig. 1 shows one channel in a system of 1-6 channels (see Fig. 1 depiction), volume control opereates by multiplying the signal by a certain number, which is the volume number (see O'Brien '737 col. 2, lines 24-26). Thus limitation "according to individual channels" is met.

Regarding Applicants' argument of claim 16 that Beard does not teach or suggest feature of claim 13 missing from the [Kondo-O'Brien] patent. Please see above response. As presented in the Office Action, Kondo in view O'Brien and further in view of Beard teaches the limitations as claimed in claim 16; and does not require to teach "features shown in Figure 15 of Applicants' drawings".

Regarding Applicants' argument of claim 18, since Kondo in view O'Brien and further in view of Beard teaches the control circuitry (40, see Beard, Fig. 2) selectively disables the pulse-width modulator (24, see Beard, Fig. 2; col. 2, lines 45-52; col. 5, lines 41-48; col. 6, lines 30-33, i.e., turns on to perform functions, disables when not required), the claimed limitations in claim 18 are also met.

As such the claims remained rejected.

CPJ

